



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,013	03/06/2006	Jun Fujita	124698	8147
27049	7590	03/04/2010	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			SCHATZ, CHRISTOPHER T	
P.O. BOX 320850				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27049@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,013	FUJITA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,6,7,9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,8 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

FINAL REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Armstrong (US 2001/0000165, newly cited).

The Applicant's Admitted Prior Art discussion discloses a method of manufacturing a honeycomb structure 3 having honeycomb segments 2 of a prism shape provided with numerous circulation holes (specification, page 2, lines 7-13), the method comprising: a masking step of attaching masking materials to both end surfaces of the honeycomb segments (specification, page 2, lines 14-16); a stacked body bonding step of bonding the honeycomb stacked body by bonding the plurality of honeycomb segments together while interposing adhesive layers therebetween (page 2, lines 17-20); an adhesive layer drying step of integrally fixing the honeycomb stacked body by heating and drying the adhesive layers (page 2, lines 21-24); a masking material separating step of separating the masking materials (page 2, line 30 – page 3, line 8); a grinding step of grinding an outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb stacked body into a predetermined shape (page 2, lines 25-29); and a coating material 4

applying and drying step of forming a coating material layer by applying a coating material to the outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb stacked body and then drying the coating material layer (page 2, lines 25-29). It is not clear if Applicant's Admitted Prior Art discloses grinding after the masking material separating step.

Armstrong discloses a method of using grinding tool to grind and finish several different types of surfaces (paragraph 0001). Armstrong further discloses that when using said grinding tool is used to grind said surfaces, the abrasive surface of the grinding tool becomes degraded with adhesive and/or glue over time (paragraph 0019). One of ordinary skill in the art reading such would have recognized that the grinding tool used to grind the honeycomb stacked body would become degraded with adhesive if grinding occurs when the masking material is still on the honeycomb stacked body because the adhesive used to attach said masking material would contaminate the grinding tool. Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art by removing the masking material before grinding in order to prevent the grinding tool from becoming contaminated with adhesive as taught by Armstrong above.

As to claim 2, the Admitted Prior Art discussion discloses such (figure 2c). As to claim 3, applicant's Admitted Prior Art discussion discloses an adhesive member comprising a base sheet and a sticky agent attached to one side of the sheet wherein the adhesive member is bonded to the end surface of the honeycomb segment through the sticky agent (page 3, lines 9-13). As to claim 11, the stacked body bonding step is preformed after the masking step page 2, lines 14-20. As to claim 12, the masking

material is removed after drying (page 2, line 21 – page 3, line 8). As to claim 13, the coating is applied after grinding.

3. Claims 1-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by JP 2002-126421 (Norihiko) in view of Armstrong.

'421 discloses a method of manufacturing a honeycomb structure 3 having honeycomb segments of a prism shape provided with numerous circulation holes, the method comprising: a masking step of attaching masking materials to both end surfaces of the honeycomb segments; a stacked body bonding step of bonding the honeycomb stacked body by bonding the plurality of honeycomb segments together while interposing adhesive layers therebetween; an adhesive layer drying step of integrally fixing the honeycomb stacked body by heating and drying the adhesive layers; a masking material separating step of separating the masking materials; a grinding step of grinding an outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb stacked body into a predetermined shape; and a coating material 13 applying and drying step of forming a coating material layer by applying a coating material to the outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb stacked body and then drying the coating material layer (sections 8-10, 13-15, figures 1, 2, 4). Additionally, the reference discloses covering the outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb with the masking material. It is not clear if '421 discloses grinding after the masking material step.

Armstrong discloses a method as discussed above. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of the '421 by removing the masking material before grinding in order to prevent the

grinding tool from becoming contaminated with adhesive as taught by Armstrong above.

As to claim 2, the reference discloses such. As to claim 3, '421 discloses a base material (adhesive sheet) and a sticky agent on the adhesive bonded to said end surface of the honeycomb segment.

As to claim 11, the stacked body bonding step is preformed after the masking step. As to claim 12, the masking material is removed after drying. As to claim 13, the coating is applied after grinding (see above cited paragraphs)

4. Claims 1-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by JP 2002-126427 in view of Armstrong.

'427 discloses a method of manufacturing a honeycomb structure 3 having honeycomb segments 2 of a prism shape provided with numerous circulation holes 31, the method comprising: a masking step of attaching masking materials to both end surfaces of the honeycomb segments (section 13 of machine translation); a stacked body bonding step of bonding the honeycomb stacked body by bonding the plurality of honeycomb segments together while interposing adhesive layers therebetween (section 13); an adhesive layer drying step of integrally fixing the honeycomb stacked body by heating and drying the adhesive layers (section 13, 34); a masking material separating step of separating the masking materials (section 20); a grinding step of grinding an outer peripheral portion of the honeycomb stacked body into a predetermined shape (sections 35-40); and a coating material 4 applying and drying step of forming a coating material layer by applying a coating material to the outer peripheral portion of the

honeycomb stacked body and then drying the coating material layer. It is not clear if '427 discloses grinding after the masking material step.

Armstrong discloses a method as discussed above. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of the '427 by removing the masking material before grinding in order to prevent the grinding tool from becoming contaminated with adhesive as taught by Armstrong above. As to claim 2, the reference discloses such. As to claim 3, '427 discloses a base material (adhesive sheet) and a sticky agent on the adhesive bonded to said end surface of the honeycomb segment. As to claim 11, the stacked body bonding step is preformed after the masking step (sections 13 and 20). As to claim 12, the masking material is removed after drying (section 20). As to claim 13, the coating is applied after grinding (sections 35-40)

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '421 and Armstrong, as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of in view of Rowland (US 5535355).

'421 and Armstrong disclose that masking material is removed from the end of the honeycomb segment, but it is not clear if the reference discloses a method wherein the masking material is subjected to brushing during the masking material removing step. Rowland discloses a method of removing a material adhered to a surface via an adhesive, wherein said material layer is subjected to brushing during the material layer removing step. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of '421 and Armstrong by subjecting the masking material to brushing during the removal step as taught by Rowland above as doing such is an efficient method of removing adhesive bound layers from surfaces (column 2, lines 32-29).

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '427 and Armstrong, as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of in view of Rowland (US 5535355).

'427 and Armstrong disclose that masking material is removed from the end of the honeycomb segment, but it is not clear if the reference discloses a method wherein the masking material is subjected to brushing during the masking material removing step. Rowland discloses a method of removing a material adhered to a surface via an adhesive, wherein said material layer is subjected to brushing during the material layer removing step. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of '427 and Armstrong by subjecting the masking material to brushing during the removal step as taught by Rowland above as doing such is an efficient method of removing adhesive bound layers from surfaces (column 2, lines 32-29).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '427 and Armstrong, or alternatively '421, as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and in view of in view of Frost (US 5021204).

It is not clear if '427, '421 and Armstrong disclose a method wherein the base sheet is made from a heat shrinkable material that shrinks during the drying step. Frost

discloses a method of end sealing a cylindrical honeycomb structure with an adhesive base sheet 23, 24, and further discloses that it is well known in the art to use a heat shrinkable sheet as an alternative (column 10, lines 56-60). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of '427 as modified by Armstrong or '421 as modified by Armstrong by using a heat shrinkable film that shrinks during heating as taught by Frost above as such is a well known alternative in the art.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2009 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ whose telephone number is 571-272-6038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Richard Crispino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791